

REMARKS

The Application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 15, 2003 (Paper No. 32). Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 to 46 and 62 to 67 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 9 and 12 are being amended, and Claims 62 to 67 are being added, herein.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,243,724 (Mander) and U.S. Patent 5,923,845 (Kamiya), and Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 to 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mander, Kamiya and U.S. Patent 5,832,470 (Morita).

According to the present invention, a plurality of folders suitable for storing a new document are selected, a user is notified of the selected plurality of candidate folders, and the new document is stored in one of the plurality of candidate folders selected by the user from among the candidate folders about which the user was notified.

Advantageously and by virtue of the above arrangement, saving a document by a user is facilitated, since the user need only select a folder for saving a document from the selected plurality of candidate folders.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 is directed to a document processing system comprising a folder retaining means, new document retaining means, notifying means and storing means. The folder retaining means retains a plurality of folders, each of the folders storing at least one document, and the new document retaining means retains a new document. The candidate folder selecting means selects a

plurality of candidate folders suitable for storing the new document as a folder to be stored. The notifying means notifies the plurality of candidate folders selected by the candidate folder selecting means to a user, and the storing means stores the new document into a selected folder selected by the user from the plurality of candidate folders.

It is conceded in the Office Action that Mander fails to teach the retaining means for retaining a new document, the notifying means for notifying a user of the plurality of candidate folders selected by said candidate folder selecting means, and storing means for storing means for storing the new document into a selected folder selected by the user from the plurality of candidate folders.

Mander is seen to describe a graphical user interface, in which documents are depicted in stacks. A user is able to create a new stack, or to create a "sub-stack" of another stack. (See Mander, Abstract, col. 7, lines 23 to 51, col. 8, lines 31 to 46 and col. 9, lines 1 to 50.) Mander describes a system in which documents are automatically filed away in a stack on the basis of a similarity match, which is not seen to be the same as notifying the user of candidate folders and allowing the user to select a folder from among the notified candidate folders, into which a new document is stored.

Nothing in Mander is seen to disclose or to suggest notifying a user of a plurality of candidate folders selected as being suitable for storing a new document, and storing the new document in the candidate folder selected by the user from among the candidate folders about which the user was notified.

Kamiya is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Mander. More particularly, Kamiya is seen to describe a system for receiving electronic document information, such as email. The new document is posted to the collector via a post input

operation directed to a post input port of the collector, and is automatically stored in a new storage area of the collector. (See Kamiya, col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 8.) Once a document is posted to the collector, a notifier notifies the user that the document has been posted to the collector, so that the user can view the posted document. At col. 9, lines 8 to 10, Kamiya describes notifying the user that a document has been posted by displaying a message, flashing a signal or making a sound. If the user accepts the document, it is automatically moved to a persistent storage area designated for the collector. (See Abstract and col. 8, lines 6 to 29 and lines 44 to 48.) Kamiya, at col. 9, line 29 to col. 10, line 4, is seen to describe the automatic copying of information into storage of a collector to which the information is directed. The automatic storage of information in a storage area of a collector, and the notification of a user that the document has been stored in the storage area is not seen to be the same as notifying the user of a plurality of candidate folders selected by a candidate folder selection means, and storing a new document in one of the candidate folders selected by the user from among the candidate folders, about which the user was notified.

Kamiya, and in particular the cited portions of Kamiya, is not seen to teach or to suggest notifying a user of a plurality of candidate folders selected by a candidate folder selection means, and storing a new document in a folder selected by the user from the candidate folders, about which the user has received notification.

Although it was applied against claims that depend from Claim 1, and not Claim 1, Morita has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted with respect to Mander and Kamiya. The hierarchical classification of folders is not seen to disclose or to suggest notifying a user of a plurality of candidate folders selected by a

candidate folder selection means, and storing a new document in a folder selected by the user from the candidate folders, about which the user has received notification.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 9 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

In addition to the features of Claim 1 discussed above, Claim 63 has the feature that the user is only notified of the plurality of candidate folders selected by the candidate folder selecting means. This feature is not seen to be disclosed or suggested by the applied art. Accordingly, Claim 63, together with Claims 65 and 67 are believed to be patentable in view of the applied art.

Claim 4 is directed to a document processing system comprising a judging means, a similarity order calculating means, a notifying means and a storing means. The judging means judges a similarity degree between document information of a new document to be stored and a plurality of sets of document information of documents stored in folders existing at a position in a sort structure. The similarity order calculating means calculates a similarity order of a plurality of folders in accordance with the similarity degree judged by the judging means. The notifying means notifies of the plurality of folders together with the similarity order calculated by the similarity order calculating means to a user, and the storing means stores the new document into a selected folder selected by the user from the plurality of folders notified by the notifying means, without changing the position in the sort structure.

Based on the above discussion, none of the applied art, namely Mander, Kamiya, nor Morita, is seen to disclose or to suggest notifying the user of a calculated

similarity order, together with a plurality of folders for which the similarity order has been calculated from a degree of similarity judged between a document to be stored and stored documents, and storing the new document in a folder selected by the user from among the folders about which the user was notified.

As discussed above and conceded in the Office Action, Mander is not seen to disclose notifying the user of selected folders. Mander is also not seen to disclose notifying the user of a calculated similarity order. Accordingly, Mander is not seen to disclose or to suggest notifying the user of a calculated similarity order, together with a plurality of folders for which the similarity order has been calculated from a degree of similarity judged between a document to be stored and stored documents, and storing the new document in a folder selected by the user from among the folders about which the user was notified.

In addition and as discussed above, the automatic storage of documents in storage areas of collectors to which the document is directed, as is understood to be described in Kamiya, is not seen to disclose or suggest notifying the user of a calculated similarity order, together with a plurality of folders for which the similarity order has been calculated from a degree of similarity judged between a document to be stored and stored documents, and storing the new document in a folder selected by the user from among the folders about which the user was notified.

Finally, the system of hierarchically classifying folders in Morita is not seen to disclose or to suggest notifying the user of a calculated similarity order, together with a plurality of folders for which the similarity order has been calculated from a degree of similarity judged between a document to be stored and stored documents, and storing the

new document in a folder selected by the user from among the folders about which the user was notified.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 4 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 10 and 13 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining pending claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-22002

CA_MAIN 73396 v 1